

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/775,712	LIU ET AL.	
	Examiner Holly Rickman	Art Unit 1773	

**All Participants:**

(1) Holly Rickman.

**Status of Application:** \_\_\_\_\_

(3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(2) Raj Dave.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

**Date of Interview:** 27 February 2007

**Time:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Type of Interview:**

Telephonic  
 Video Conference  
 Personal (Copy given to:  Applicant  Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated:  Yes  No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

*rejections of record*

Claims discussed:

*all pending*

Prior art documents discussed:

*art of record*

**Part II.**


**SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:**

*See Continuation Sheet*

**Part III.**

It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

**HOLLY RICKMAN  
PRIMARY EXAMINER**

  
 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner proposed amendment of claims 18 and 20 to correct minor informalities. Also proposed amendment of claim 16 to clarify that electrolessly deposited layer is on top of the sputter deposited NiP layer. Attorney Davé agreed to an examiner's amendment making the proposed changes.